DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 784 CS 500 703

AUTHOR	Bitzer, Lloyd F.; And Others
TITLE	Report of the Research Priorities Division of the Speech Communication Association.
INSTITUTION	Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	17p.; Reports presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Speech Communication Association (9th, Chicago, July 12-14, 1973); Also in "Proceedings" published by Speech Communication Association, edited by R. Jeffrey and W. Work, pp. 120-132
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Decision Making; Freedom of Speech; Higher Education; Mass Media; *Media Research; *Organization; *Research Needs; Research Problems; *Speech
IDENTIFIERS	*Speech Communication Association

ABSTRACT

A wide variety of topics are discussed in relation to research needs and classified in relation to problem areas, decision-making areas, and recommendations. Areas under discussion include an examination of the decision-making structure of the Speech Communication Association, criteria by which decisions can be evaluated, conceptualizing the decision-making process, the role of computers and other technological advances, the funding of research, problems of freedom of speech, public access to the mass media, and thrusting unwanted communication on unwilling recipients. Twenty-one recommendations which suggest the future direction of the Speech Communication Association in the area of research are included. Recommendations were made for broadening of the theoretical perspectives used to study speech communication, providing graduate students with more intensive and specialized training in particular theoretical positions or research methodologies, improving the language used by the research community, establishing research priorities, and broadening training and use of various methodologies for the study of speech communication. (RB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Speech Communication Association TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED 091784

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH PRIORITIES DIVISION

Overview

Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director

The central problem areas discussed by Research Division conferees were selected on the recommendation of the SCA Research Board (Lloyd F. Bitzer, Herbert Simons, and John W. Bowers). The members of the Board had studied the Airlie Conference Report and concluded that three areas of inquiry would be particularly timely and appropriate for Summer Conference discussion.

The first area selected was "The Future of Communication Research." Numerous Airlie recommendations related to this area; but in addition, the Board though that the future of SCA would be influenced in important ways by what we say we are doing when we engage in "communication research." And this is why, we thought, a most appropriate topic of discussion would deal with both what communication research will become and what communication research should become in the future. Gerald R. Miller, former Chairman of the Research Board and a participant in the Airlie Conference, consented to chair the group that would discuss The Future of Communication Research.

The second area selected was "Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making." In selecting this area, the Board was responding directly to a specific charge in the Airlie Conference Report, namely Recommendation O-5:

> The Legislative Council should establish a task force to propose and field-test participatory modes of decision-making for large, non-face-to-face groups. The task force will implement this recommendation as follows:
>
> 1) Undertake research into the literature of mass participation in goal-setting and decision-making, and set up site visits where community and organization groups are making efforts in this direction.
> 2) Propose several alternative or complementary procedures to facilitate membership participation in SCA goal-setting and decision-making.
> 3) Arrange a field test by applying recommended procedures to specific issues or decision areas for a specific term, with appropriate tests of effectiveness.
> 4) Adopt the procedures passing the effectiveness tests with or without amendments to the constitution or by-laws.
> 5) Make appropriate efforts to disseminate the results of the research to relevant publics.
>
> Implementation: The Legislative Council will be asked in December, 1972, to establish the task force on participatory modes of decision-making called for.

CS 500 703

This area of inquiry was thought to be "on target" for the Summer Conference, since the task force had yet to do the major work given it by the Airlie recommendation and because conferees in the Summer Conference could actually help determine the specific problems and recommendations of the task force. Kenneth E. Andersen, who had already been appointed Chairman of the Task Force on Participatory Modes of Decision-Making, agreed to chair the group.

The third area selected was "Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech." Two factors strongly influenced selection of this topic. First, some of the most exciting ideas of the Airlie Conference document deal with problems in the field of "freedom of communication." Second, the Research Board had already developed a project, headed by Franklyn S. Haiman, that would focus on such problems as freedom of access to communication channels, audiences, etc. Haiman agreed to chair the Summer Conference group interested in Freedom of Speech.

Of the conferees who elected to work with one of the Research Division Groups, the largest number (about thirty) comprised Group 1: The Future of Communication Research. The others -- Group II: Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making and Group III: Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech -- consisted of about eight to twelve participants. While most conferees "stayed with" one Group, several moved in and out of two or three Groups.

After the three Groups had completed discussions, all Research Division conferees met in Plenary Session in order to hear reports from the Groups and to take action on recommendations. In the following pages, the reports and recommendations of the Groups are presented, in order. Each report or recommendation was open to discussion and parliamentary deliberation. Some recommendations were modified on the floor, but in the short time available to us we could do little more than suggest to Group chairmen that certain changes in conception or language would be desirable. Soon after the Summer Conference, the three Group chairmen -- Miller, Andersen, and Haiman -- prepared drafts of reports and recommendations adopted at the Plenary Session. These reports and recommendations -- with minor editorial changes -- are produced below:

GROUP ONE: THE FUTURE OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Gerald R. Miller, Chairperson

Conferees in Group One discussed the future of communication research. Because of the Group's composition, most of the dialogue centered on behavioral approaches to communication research. The absence of recommendations pertaining to other intellectual perspectives in no way implies that these perspectives are unimportant; rather, the group product reflects the intellectual priorities of most of its members.

The conferees agreed that there should be a broadening of the theoretical perspectives used to study speech communication. With this objective in mind, the following recommendations were accepted:

Recommendation 1: SCA should encourage graduate departments in speech communication, wherever possible, to provide instruction in various theoretical perspectives. One area that warrants greater attention is systems theory. In that area, instruction should focus on the logical and empirical requirements of such systems paradigms as cybernetic systems, structural functionalism, and general systems theory, and on approaches to modeling communication problems in each of the paradigms.

Recommendation 2: SCA should commission papers by recognized authorities on the logic of these various theoretical perspectives such as systems theory. Such papers might be developed through the ERIC project, published in the Association journals, or emanate from the national office.

Recommendation 3: The composition of the editorial boards of Association journals should include persons qualified to evaluate research grounded in these various theoretical perspectives. If necessary to achieve this end, associate editors should be selected from disciplines other than speech communication.

Conferees discussed the need to provide some graduate students with more intensive, specialized training in particular theoretical positions or research methodologies. While not wishing to deny curricular opportunities for those graduate students requiring more extensive, broader programs, the Group did adopt the following recommendation:

Recommendation 4: SCA should encourage that graduate instruction in the conceptualization, design, execution, and interpretation of research reflect greater depth of analysis, particularly with reference to examination of the logical and empirical requirements of various modes of inquiry.

Conferees noted the ambiguity of much of the language used in the research community. As a beginning step in reducing this ambiguity, the following recommendation was adopted:

Recommendation 5: SCA should commission papers aimed at explicating more thoroughly and precisely the conceptual and operational vocabulary of speech communication research. Such papers might be developed through the ERIC project, published in the Association journals, or emanate from the national office.

Conferees discussed numerous substantive areas for research. The following recommendations reflect the felt priorities of group members:

Recommendation 6: SCA should encourage, as an area of high priority research, increased investigation of nonverbal message variables, both as inputs and outputs of human communication.

Recommendation 7: SCA should sponsor a conference on nonverbal variables in human communication.

Recommendation 8: SCA should encourage more research which aims at precise rhetorical description and which seeks to develop new methods for treating the message as a dependent variable.

Finally, conferees spent the most time discussing the need to broaden training in, and use of, various methodologies for the study of speech communication. The following recommendations were an outgrowth of this discussion:

Recommendation 9: SCA should sponsor a conference to address the following question: How can speech communication researchers maximally utilize available empirical methods in the generation of knowledge about human communication? The product of such a conference might include: (a) an assessment of the current status of research methodology in speech communication, (b) an examination and evaluation of extant empirical methods infrequently employed in current speech communication research, (c) a set of recommendations to graduate departments and individual researchers regarding the feasibility of expanding the number and scope of methodologies utilized and the areas of speech communication research that apparently demand new methodologies, and (d) a proposed set of criteria for selecting methodologies to be used in future communication research. Moreover, the SCA Research Board should treat the funding of such a conference as a high priority item.

Recommendation 10: SCA should immediately begin to develop a methodology bank, possibly in conjunction with the resources of ERIC, which would contain a brief description of various methodologies and a bibliography of sources for each.

Recommendation 11: SCA should commission papers by recognized authorities on various research methodologies. Such papers might be developed through the ERIC project, might be published in the Association journals, or could emanate from the national office.

Recommendation 12: SCA should commission instructional packages to inform researchers regarding new methodologies. These packages should be available for purchase at the SCA National Convention and from the national office. Such packages might include description of the technique, its assumptions and limitations, and several examples of implementation.

Recommendation 13: SCA should investigate the possibility of publishing a periodic review of methodologies and measurement.

Recommendation 14: SCA should sponsor short courses at conventions dealing with particular methodologies and their applications to speech communication research.

A final recommendation concerning facilitation of data collection:

Recommendation 15: SCA should seek to establish a central data bank and clearing house for the cooperative use of speech communication researchers.

The meeting ended with some discussion of several of the Airlie Conference recommendations; however, no specific action was taken on any of these recommendations.

GROUP TWO: RESEARCH DEALING WITH MODELS OF DECISION-MAKING

Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairperson

This report summarizes the ideas and recommendations of the group exploring participatory decision-making in large non-face-to-face groups with emphasis on the structure of SCA. The Group began its discussion by considering possible implications of Recommendation O-5 of the Airlie Conference, which called for creation of a task force to propose and field-test participatory modes of decision-making. It was noted also that the discussions of conferees at Summer Conference IX will serve as direct input to the task force.

The Group discussed a number of areas for research in decision-making. It agreed to concentrate on large non-face-to-face groups with particular attention to the problems in and structure of the SCA. Becuase of time limitations, the Group decided not to attempt to rank research priorities but simply to identify them. On the basis of its discussion, the Group adopted several recommendations which were presented to the Plenary Session of the Research Division. This report briefly summarizes the research areas identified and then lists the recommendations adopted, their disposition in the Plenary Session, and the method of action-implementation. It should be noted that numerous recommendations call for action by the time of the November convention and so need immediate attention.

Suggested Research Areas

A wide variety of topics were discussed in relation to research needs. This report classifies topics in relation to problem areas perceived by the Chairperson as emerging in the discussion.

Problem Area 1. Criteria by which decisions can be evaluated. Basic to research on the value and means of involving larger numbers of people in

decision-making is the issue of the value of decisions reached. What is a "good" or a "better" decision? Should decisions be evaluated in terms of the decisions themselves or in terms of the process by which decisions are reached? Decisions or the processes in reaching decisions may be subjected to judgment on the basis of various values: expectations of those involved or affected; effects upon those involved, the organization, or the society; effects upon future decisions or participation; acceptability; workability; commitment to implementation; short term effects versus long term effects; etc.

Problem Area 2. Conceptualizing the decision-making process. A number of models of decision-making are available and a variety of rubrics are provided by these models. A number of studies have been conducted of decision-making -- especially in game theory approaches and in small-group research. Can these be generalized to large non-face-to-face groups? Should the decision-making be approached in terms of a cooperative or a competitive frame, as investigative or judicial, as ratification or participation, as debate or discussion or persuasion, as rational-reflective versus motivational, etc. Can research findings in one setting be generalized to others.

Problem Area 3. Commitment to values. The values and expectations which people hold concerning the process or product affect judgments of the worth of the decision and also affect the process itself. The role of values and expectations in decision-making needs to be assessed. How important is the right to dissent, the right to ratify or take exception, the opportunity for debate and deliberation, the access to the decision-making structures?

Problem Area 4. Current participation in decision-making. With reference to the SCA and other decision-making groups, the members' current perceptions of the possibilities of involvement and of their actual involvement need to be assessed. What effects do people perceive their current involvement to have? Further, what is their action involvement and its effects on themselves, the organization, and the larger society?

A study of various professional organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and governmental groups might reveal current patterns of decision-making, satisfaction with decisions in terms of a variety of criteria, and methods used to assess the quality or adequacy of decisions.

Scholars need to examine the interface of various decision-making structures in terms of the interrelationships of various formal and informal decision-making groups in communities and in organizations - with particular emphasis on communication patterns. How do the various SCA decision-making groups interface? How do the various decision-making groups in a city or country interface?

Problem Area 5. Effects of increased participation. Does the quality of decisions improve? If a person becomes involved at one time, does he tend to maintain involvement? How does involvement affect other aspects

of his life? Does being involved in one thing mean a person is not involved in something else; or, like media exposure, does involvement in one thing correlate with involvement in many things? What are effects of increased participation on the individual? On the organization ? Do the gains from increased participation outweigh the costs, i.e., loss of speed, possibly increased frustration, monetary cost, etc. ?

Problem Area 6. Methods of increasing participation. Assuming that increased participation is valuable, how can such an increase be obtained? Do people really want to become involved in decision-making? Do people want to participate or just be allowed to vote? What levels and kinds of participation are possible? How does structure affect decisions and participation in decision-making? How can people in non-face-to-face groups be provided with the information and dialogue essential to good decision-making? (Voting studies suggest that increase in the number of voters means attracting the least informed, least interested into the voting booth.)

Problem Area 7. What are the effects of increased participation? Does the quality of individual decisions improve? In what senses? Do morale and commitment increase? Does involvement increase the probability of future involvement? Is the illusion of increased participation more important than real participation?

Problem Area 8. Role of computers and other technological advances. What is the role of computers, cable systems, new means of dissemination of information, etc. in terms of the process by which decisions are achieved or in ratification/selection of the particular decision? Can we replace representative democracy by direct democracy? Should every member of a community have a button on his telephone and vote yes or no on every issue coming before the city council? Can we do away with conventions?

Problem Area 9. Research funding. Sociology, political science, urban studies, and mass communication are also interested in this area. Should interdisciplinary research opportunities be investigated? While the SCA ought to be prepared to undertake research of its own structure and procedures, might money be found to aid such research? Questions relating to community involvement, under such labels as participatory democracy, community involvement, self-determination, are of great interest to many funding agencies. What agencies are most interested? What levels of funding may be expected?

Problem Area 10. The SCA. Much of the discussion related to the problem areas noted above was in the context of the SCA and its use of participatory decision-making. People at the meeting had very different perceptions of the possibilities of and the nature of participation in the decision-making process of SCA. Many thought there was no possibility of meaningful involvement; others saw every possibility of meaningful involvement but little interest in such involvement.

Problem Area 11. Bibliography. Many came to the session hoping to take away bibliographies and papers bearing on decision-making. Some effort to meet this need is being undertaken by asking each participant to contribute five items to an annotated bibliography which will be assembled and distributed.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were adopted by the study group as resolutions and presented to the Plenary Session on Research Priorities. The actions of the Plenary Session were supportive in every instance.

Recommendation 1. In its research and study, the task force on participatory decision-making in large non-face-to-face groups should be concerned both with SCA structures and procedures and community and/or organizational decision-making structures, but it should give priority to SCA issues.

Recommendation 2. A membership packet should be developed by SCA. The packet should focus on the structure of SCA, provide copies of the Constitution and By-Laws, and describe the variety of methods and situations in which members may become actively involved and influence decisions. (The Plenary Session endorsed this view and agreed that all SCA members should be included in the initial mailing, since many current members need the information as much as future new members.)

Recommendation 3. An orientation meeting should be held at the next two conventions and should be subjected to appropriate tests of effectiveness. The meetings should describe the SCA structure and the various ways in which members may become involved in the decision-making process of the Association. Further, the convention meetings should suggest ways of "getting full value"from the convention. (Endorsed with additional stress on suggesting ways to maximize the value of attendance at the convention. Andersen will transmit this recommendation to SCA First Vice-President Becker, who is in charge of program planning for the 1973 SCA convention, asking for implementation. Members of the study group will assist in the program as desired by Becker. The resolution will also be forwarded to William Work for transmission to the Administrative Committee and other appropriate groups.)

Recommendation 4. SCA should catalog all in-house documents and studies of possible interest to the membership and make these available for purchase at cost. (many members have expressed interest in board reports, surveys, working documents such as position papers for the Airlie Conference, etc. While often briefly summarized in Spectra, much information is lost; thus individual members do not obtain information which might be of special interest and value to them.)

Recommendation 5. SCA should test its willingness to commit itself to a participatory system of decision-making by involving all SCA members in deliberation and decision regarding proposed 'division of labor' among and naming of

the three SCA Journals. (Endorsed with the notation that no clear means of testing is mandated in the resolution.)

Recommendation 6. (Not reported to the Plenary Session.) A general study of the decision-making methods and structures in the SCA and the current utilization of these methods by the membership should be undertaken. (A study currently being conducted by Charles Redding and Mark Knapp may be doing this. The task force was urged to discover the nature of the current study and to proceed as warranted.)

GROUP THREE: RESEARCH ON PROBLEMS OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairperson

[Note: Chairperson Haiman noted that, during the meeting of his Group, the conferees elected to identify problems and file a report, rather than make specific recommendations. The following report, then, is the product of discussions by Group Three. While the report contains specific research proposals, the presentation at the Plenary Session did not offer specific recommendations for adoption. However, the Pleanary Session did vote to adopt the full report. In addition, it was moved that: a copy of this report be sent to Professor Thomas Tedford, Chairman of the SCA Commission on Freedom of Speech and that the Commission be urged to take a more aggressive role in initiating and promoting such research as the report discusses. The motion was adopted. -L.F.B.]

The Group agreed at the outset of its sessions to work through a series of several specific problem areas in which research contributions from the speech communication discipline might be useful, and to attempt to phrase questions which might lend themselves to profitable empirical, experimental, historical or critical research. The problem areas were taken up in the order of their interest to the members of the Group present, and the discussion of each area was preceded by a brief description from the Chairman of the present state of the law with respect to that topic.

Problem Area A - Symbolic Conduct

In summarizing the present state of the law on this matter, the Chairman noted the confusion that exists in attempting to distinguish symbolic conduct from other kinds of behavior for the purposes of determining whether that conduct is entitled to First Amendment protection. The standards set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court in the draft-card burning case, U.S vs. O'Brien, were reviewed, as were some of the flag desecration and topless dancer cases, and Chief Justice Warren Burger's comments on the subject in his recent obscenity decision, Milier vs. California.

The Group agreed that it would be helpful if courts and others, in approaching this problem, were to recognize that all behavior or conduct communicates,

and that the question of the extent to which a particular act is primarily symbolic might be most usefully viewed in terms of a continuum. It was felt that consideration must be given to both the intent of the actor (i.e. is he intending to communicate some message with his long hair, or flag vest) and to the question of whether the behavior is perceived by others as a symbolic act. Specific research proposals that were suggested included:

1. Efforts to review the ways in which the concept of "intent" has been utilized in other areas of the law, and to determine if analogies can be made to the problems of symbolic conduct.

2. Reviews of what the courts have actually done, in free speech cases, with the variable of "intent."

3. Empirical studies of the self-perceptions of communicative intent or non-intent by those who might be thought to be engaging in symbolic conduct, as well as by artists, writers, etc. who use symoblic conduct in their work (e.g. explicit sex on stage or screen). Parallel empirical studies might be done with the viewers of symbolic conduct to determine what intents they perceive. It was suggested that, though recognizing the risks, some experimental field research might be done in which symbolic conduct is staged, and viewers of the act are interviewed to determine reactions.

4. The development of a taxonomy of symbolic conduct.

5. On the assumption that symbolic conduct does not become a "free speech problem" unless the particular conduct is perceived by others as harmful or offensive to them, we might do well to gather more data than we now have concerning the kinds of symbolic conduct that are most likely to be viewed as harmful or offensive, the degree of harm or offense involved, and the reasons that harm or offense is percieved.

6. Picking up on keynote speaker Neil Postman's discussion of contextual variables, efforts might be made to determine the effects of such variables on responses to symbolic conduct (e.g. if viewing an act of sexual intercourse in a movie is regarded as less offensive than seeing it in Times Square, why is this so?)

Problem Area B - Public Access to the Mass Media

The Chairman opened the discussion by suggesting the following subtopics in this area of concern:

1. How much do individuals and groups that may not now have access to the media desire to have it, and what would they be equipped to do with it if they had it? Can they be more motivated to use it and better trained to do so?

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages, in terms of credibility and other aspects of communication effectiveness, when minority, deviant, or unpopular messages are promulgated through direct public access to the media in contrast to communication of those messages by surrogates--journalists, commentators, media-produced documentaries, etc.

3. How receptive are present mass media owners and managers to efforts to secure public access? (e.g. can "Free Speech Messages" be contracted for, as they have been in the San Francisco Bay Area?)

4. What are the potential problems in gathering and holding an audience once public access to the mass media is achieved?

5. What can be learned from the practices of foreign countries regarding public access--e.g. allocation of time on government television to political parties, etc.

In addition to discussing these proposals, the following ideas were generated from the Group:

1. What has been the experience where public access has been made available on cable TV, as in New York City? (One study has already been done of this sort; others would be helpful). Specifically, who broadcasts, who watches, and with what effect?

2. How many more letters to the editors of newspapers and magazines (if any) are received than are published? What percentage are screened out, and by what criteria? Similarly, how many more calls are made to talk shows than can get a line through, and what percentage of these, if any, are screened out? Again, by what criteria?

3. What have been the survival problems of underground newspapers, and why have those which have survived been able to make it?

4. If government financing or technical assistance were to be made available to support public access to the media, how could it be equitably allocated? To the extent that size of constituency is a criterion, those who need help the most might get it the least. But, then, does it not make sense that a communicator must "earn" the right to such support--otherwise a disproportionately high amount of aid might be provided to the most worthless communication.

5. Empirical studies might be made of the correlation between victory in political campaigns and amount of mass media communication utilized.

Problem Area C - The Thrusting of Unwanted Communication on Unwilling Recipients

Again the Group commenced by agreeing that the concepts involved in this problem area are unacceptably hazy and that much more clarity must be achieved at the conceptual level before progress can be made in solving the extremely difficult problems we confront. It was suggested, for example, that there are

various degrees of intrusiveness of different modes of public communication--billboards, bumper stickers, unsolicited mail, unwanted telephone calls, offensive ... or television ... etc. -- and ...ed to know much more than we do about how the intrusiveness of these media is perceived by respondents.

It was also suggested that a significant variable is the actual and/or the perceived captivity of the audience in question. What correlation is there, we ought to find out, between an audience's perception of its freedom of choice to be in that audience and its receptiveness to the communication that occurs there? Is even this variable affected by other variables?

More specific questions that were proposed for study were:

1. Is communication by sound usually perceived as more intrusive than visual communication? Is a person, in fact, more captive to sound than to sight?

2. How do people actually feel about being exposed to communications which they dislike or with which they disagree? What are the variables that determine one's willingness to remain exposed to such stimuli?

3. Are irritation and offensiveness in communication necessarily antithetical to effective persuasion, and, if not, under what conditions are they not?

4. How viable a solution to the alleged problem of public thrusting of unwanted communication would be a system in which there would be no restraints or penalties imposed by the state for such communication, but rather civil suits might be undertaken against the communicator by those individuals who felt harmed or offended?

5. Why is the assumption generally made and accepted inour society that the public thrusting of unwanted sexually-oriented communication is more legitimately to be restrained than the public thrusting of other kinds of unwanted communication--political, religious, etc.

Problem Area D - Commercial Speech

Again, the Chairman briefly reviewed the present state of the law in this area, which simply stated, is that commercial speech is not now protected by the First Amendment. The Group then discussed the inadequacies of present definitions as to what is and what is not commercial speech, and the resulting possible injustices that exist as a result of this simplistic dichotomy created by the Supreme Court.

It was agreed that, in this area, a good deal of public attitude research might be useful. How do most people actually feel about commercial communication, as compared to its non-commercial counterparts? How can we account for the acceptance of government regulations designed to protect consumers from being taken advantage of by commercial speech, and the contrasting "Let The Buyer Beware" attitude in non-commercial areas? Are the bases for that

distinction (such as, perhaps, that the one involves verifiable facts and the other involves debatable values) well founded?

Problem Area E - Libel

The question was briefly raised and discussed as to whether the libel exception to the protections of the First Amendment is still viable. It was suggested that the experience with alternative solutions -- such as right to reply legislation -- ought to be examined. Also, it was proposed that creative minds might be able to come up with some simulation experiments in which we might be able to learn what might happen in a society where there were no laws against libel. It was also suggested that some interesting interview research might be done with those who have been plaintiffs and defendants in libel actions, to determine their perceptions of the efficacy of such litigation.

Problem Area F - Obscenity

The Group touched only briefly, at the end of its session, on the obscenity issue, which had not been on the originally agreed-upon agenda. The following ideas for research were suggested:

1. By what process have changes in public attitudes concerning the obscene occurred?

2. What kinds of consequences for a society flow from increased permissiveness with respect to allegedly obscene communication? Does the utterance make the action more possible, and if so, should that be a matter of concern?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

P R O C E E D I N G S

Speech Communication Association
Summer Conference IX

Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication

Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 12-14, 1973

Edited By
Robert C. Jeffrey
and
William Work

Speech Communication Association
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

PREFACE

In September 1972, the Speech Communication Association sponsored a conference at Airlie House, Virginia to consider long-range goals and priorities for the Association and the profession. The seventeen conferees at the Airlie Conference generated a report (published in the April, 1973 issue of Spectra) that was widely discussed at the 1972 SCA Convention in December. The Legislative Council at that convention approved plans for the 1973 Summer Conference to expand upon the "Airlie Report."

The basic purpose of the Ninth Annual SCA Summer Conference was to extend the impact of the Airlie Conference by democratizing participation. The planners of the Conference predicted that those attending would contribute significantly to thought about the future of the profession by further defining goals, designing implementation strategies, and establishing priorities. To that end, all members of the SCA were invited to participate.

Since the "Airlie Report" presented recommendations in three broad areas—Education, Research, and Futurism—, the major divisions of the Conference were arranged to reflect those areas. Participants in Division A considered Education priorities, those in Division B dealt with Research priorities and those in Division C reflected on Futuristic priorities. Divisions A and B were each further organized into three Groups and Division C into two Groups. Participants, upon registering for the Conference, were asked to select the Division and Group in which he/she would like to participate. The Conference Program, reproduced in this report, sets out the sequence of events within the Groups and Divisions over the one and a half day conference.

The Division directors were asked to keep careful records of the deliberations within the Division, particularly of the recommendations and supporting rationales. They were also asked to collect any materials that were distributed to the Groups for reproduction in these Proceedings. Division Directors Ronald Allen and Lloyd Bitzer of the University of Wisconsin and Frank Dance of the University of Denver were diligent and aggressively original in planning for the work of the Divisions, and they were prompt in forwarding materials for publication. I am deeply indebted to them. The product of their labors and those of the Group chairmen forms the basis for this publication.

Major contributions were made to the Conference by Neil Postman of New York University who delivered a provocative and stimulating keynote address, and by L.S. Harms of the University of Hawaii, who concluded the conference with a look into the future, as the luncheon speaker. Transcripts of their addresses appear in these Proceedings.

The Director of the Conference is grateful to William Work, Executive Secretary of the SCA, for his efficiency in coordinating the efforts of many people who contributed to the Conference. The major kudos, however, go to the participants who generated the thought represented on the pages that follow.

Robert C. Jeffrey
Conference Director

PROGRAM
SCA SUMMER CONFERENCE IX

Palmer House, Chicago — July 12-14, 1973

Thursday Evening, July 12

8:00 pm	Keynote Address: Neil Postman, New York University
9:00 pm	No Host Reception

Friday, July 13

9:00 am	'The Airlie Conference,' First Vice-President Samuel L. Becker
9:15 a.m.	SCA Summer Conference IX Overview President Robert C. Jeffrey
9:30-9:55 am	Organization of Conference Divisions
Division A:	Education Priorities, Ronald R. Allen, Director
Division B:	Research Priorities, Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director
Division C:	Futuristic Priorities, Frank E.X. Dance, Director
9:55-10:15 am	Coffee Break
10:15 am-12:15 pm	Division Groups Meet
A: Group 1:	Competency-Based Teacher Education, Gustav Friedrich, Chairman
Group 2:	Communication in the Secondary School Language Arts Curricula, Edward Pappas, Chairman
Group 3:	New Thrusts in Departmental Organization and the Preparation of Teachers, Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairman
B: Group 1:	The Future of Communication Research, Gerald R. Miller, Chairman
Group 2:	Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making, Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman
Group 3:	Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech, Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairman
C: Group 1:	The Communication Needs & Rights of Mankind, L.S. Harms, Alton Barbour, Chairmen
Group 2:	Future Communication Technologies: Hardware and Software, William Conboy, Larry Wilder, & Jack Barwind, Chairmen
12:15-2:00 pm	Lunch Break
2:00-5:30 pm	Division Group Meetings Continue
8:00-10:30 pm	Optional Division Group Meetings

Saturday, July 14

9:00-10:40 am	Plenary Sessions: Divisions A, B, C.
10:40-11:00 am	Coffee Break
11:00-12:00 noon	Conference Plenary Session: Recommendations and Priorities
12:15-2:00 pm	Conference Luncheon Address: L.S. Harms, University of Hawaii, "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

Presiding at all General Sessions: Robert C. Jeffrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface — Robert C. Jeffrey, Conference Director. i

Keynote Address — Neil Postman. 1

Report of Division A: Education Priorities:

- Overview — R. R. Allen, Division Director. 10
- Group One Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Gustav W. Friedrich, Group Chairperson. . . . 10
- Group Two Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Edward J. Pappas, Group Chairperson. 12
- Group Three Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Group Chairperson. . . 15
- Summary
- Appendix A: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Competency-Based Teacher Education. 22
- Appendix B: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula. 50
- Appendix C: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers. 85

Report of Division B: Research Priorities

- Overview — Lloyd F. Bitzer, Division Director. 120
- Group One Report: Recommendations — Gerald R. Miller, Group Chairperson. 121
- Group Two Report: Recommendations — Kenneth B. Andersen, Group Chairperson. . . 124
- Group Three Report: — Franklyn S. Haiman, Group Chairperson. . . . 128

Report of Division C. Futuristic Priorities

- Overview — Frank E.X. Dance, Division Director. 133
- Group One Report — Alton Barbour, Group Chairperson. 133
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Group Two Report: — William Conboy, Larry Wilder, Jack Barwind, Group Co-Chairpersons. . . . 135
  - General Statement
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Appendix: Prepared Materials and Bibliographies on Future Communication Technologies. 137

Luncheon Address: "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future" — L.S. Harms. 158